

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/645,810	08/21/2003	Scott Andrew Ciarrocca	GYN-5004	7879	
27777	7590 04/04/2006		EXAMINER		
PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON			VRETTAKOS, PETER J		
	& JOHNSON SON & JOHNSON PLAZA	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
NEW BRUN	ISWICK, NJ 08933-7003		3739		
			DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/645,810		CIARROCCA, SCOTT ANDREW				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Peter J. Vre		3739				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Fail Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RECHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING INSIGNS OF THE MAILING INSIGNS OF THE MORE IN T	NG DATE OF THIS FR 1.136(a). In no event on. period will apply and will a statute, cause the applica	S COMMUNICATIO , however, may a reply be to expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ation to become ABANDONI	N). imely filed in the mailing date of this c ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)[\	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	20 January 2006						
•	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.							
3)□	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
٠,۵	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4) 🖂	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the application.							
, —	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-7.9-21</u> is/are rejected.							
6)⊠								
YY 7)□	7) Claim(s) 8 is/are objected to.							
8)□	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicat	tion Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) \square The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:								
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
	•							
Attachme	• •		4) 🔲 Intonvious Comerce	n/ (PTO 442)				
	ice of References Cited (PTO-892) ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9-	48)	4) Interview Summai Paper No(s)/Mail	Date				
3) 🔲 Info	rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/ er No(s)/Mail Date	SB/08)	5)	Patent Application (PT	O-152)			

Art Unit: 3739

DETAILED ACTION

The action is final.

The amendment to claim 1 is unintelligible. The remainder of rejections are not sufficient to obviate prior rejections. Klicek is a monopolar and bipolar electrosurgical instrument.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Amended claim 1 is unintelligible. The Specification provides no obvious clarification. Perhaps a telephone interview could resolve this issue.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

⁽b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 10/645,810

Art Unit: 3739

Claims 1-6, 9-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Klicek (5,472,442).

Klicek discloses an electrosurgical instrument (figure 1) comprising a converting element (see figure 5, see depicted movable switch that connects 15b to the active lead and alternatively as the return lead), an activating element (12'; col. 5:29-31) disposed on a handle (11), fluid and vacuum delivery (26, 27; col. 6:55-60), an electrosurgical generator (16), a shaft (23), all for choosing mono-polar or bipolar modes, which potentially correspond to either cutting, coagulation, or fulguration as disclosed in col. 2:33-63; col. 6:22-27; col. 7:1-3. Klicek also discloses a plurality (2) of active electrodes (14, 15b, figure 3, col. 7:41-44, key phrase "active electrode and the return electrode are common"). Lastly, the return electrode (15a) always has a greater surface area than the active electrode (14) as depicted in figure 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klicek in view of Johnson et al. (4,911,159).

Klicek neglects to expressly disclose concentric design configurations as claimed by the Applicant.

Application/Control Number: 10/645,810

Art Unit: 3739

Johnson discloses in an analogous electrosurgical instrument, a converting element that is placed partially concentrically (see the helical wire, which the Office contends is part of a converting element, wrapped around element 70 in figure 7) around the active electrode (70)

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Klicek in view of Johnson by disclosing concentric design configurations as claimed by the Applicant. The motivation would be to choose a patented design configuration to create a functional device. This is especially true because Klicek's figures provide little else with regards to the converting element besides drawings of simple switches with arrows indicating the potential switch movement providing little guidance to a designer/engineer.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art neglects to disclose an insulating member as claimed. The accompanying element (52) in the Application is well depicted in use in figures 4a and 4b.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J. Vrettakos whose telephone number is 571-272-4775. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda C. Dvorak can be reached on 571-272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/645,810

Art Unit: 3739

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pete Vrettakos March 30, 2006

ROY D. GIBSON RIMARY EXAMINER